Pam
Misc.
c2

JUL 29 1949

Christian Responsibility in World Affairs

A SYMPOSIUM

UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE

COMMISSION OF THE CHURCHES

ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

April 1949

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Columbia University Libraries

https://archive.org/details/christianrespons00comm

A Symposium

Christian Responsibility in World Affairs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Role of Christianity in International Affairs *Arnold J. Toynbee*	5
Spiritual Implication of the Human Rights Covenant *Charles H. Malik*	7
Christian Missions and World Order *Charles W. Ranson*	11
An Ecumenical Approach to the Soviet-Western Tensions *W. A. Visser 't Hooft*	15
The Churches and the United Nations *John Foster Dulles*	19

INTRODUCTION

The Commission of the Churches on International Affairs was initially established in August of 1946, under the joint sponsorship of the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council. Its constitution as a permanent agency was formally authorized by the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches, August 22—September 4, 1948, and by the Committee of the International Missionary Council at Oegstgeest, September 7-10, 1948.

The primary purpose of the Commission is to serve the constituency of the parent bodies as a "source of stimulus and knowledge in their approach to international problems, as a medium of common counsel and action, and as their organ in formulating the Christian mind on world issues and in bringing that mind effectively to bear upon such issues."

In the spring of 1949, a combination of circumstances brought to the New York area from various parts of the world, Christian leaders who hold membership on the International Affairs Commission. Their statements, made at an informal dinner on April 29, stressed the important part which Christians must play as the world seeks effective solution of its disturbing problems. In response to numerous requests these statements are now made available to a wider circle of readers.

KENNETH G. GRUBB, *Chairman*
London

O. FREDERICK NOLDE, *Director*
New York

THE ROLE OF CHRISTIANITY IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS*

by Arnold J. Toynbee

Christianity has, of course, a role in all human affairs, because Christianity is concerned with the relation of human souls to God, and all human affairs are part of God's creation and God's kingdom.

Today we are specially concerned with the role of Christianity in international affairs, because politics in general, and international affairs in particular, are one of the slum areas of human life, in which human beings have been much less successful than in, for example, family affairs or technological affairs.

The present world-wide network of international relations is an expansion of the international relations of the Western European countries during the last four hundred years.

This modern secular system of international affairs arose out of the breakdown of the medieval attempt, in Western Christendom, to organize international affairs under the leadership of the Western Christian Church.

While it is true that the medieval Western Church failed mainly through its own fault, it is also true that the repudiation of the authority of religion in international relations is the main reason why international affairs have gone wrong. States, classes and ideologies have become objects of an idolatrous religious worship; hence the increasing violence of international conflicts.

The role of Christianity in international affairs should be to help Western man to recover his sense of the relative values of things. In so far as man re-transfers his worship back to God from the state or class or ideology to which he pays allegiance, he will find himself able, incidentally, to make a better job of politics—both domestic and international—than he has managed to make of them in modern times. Politics cannot be managed successfully unless they are subordinated to religion. There are alternative ways of making religion paramount, and we can profit

---

**An Abstract of Dr. Toynbee's Address.*

from our medieval predecessors' experience by trying to avoid their mistakes.

Believing, as we do, that religion matters more than politics, let us turn our question around and ask ourselves: 'What is the role of international affairs in the life of Christianity?'

Within the last four hundred years, the Western European network of international relations has spread from one tiny corner of the world over the whole face of the planet. This political and economic unification of the world has provided a world-wide field of action for Christianity—and also (I personally would add) for the other living higher religions: Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam.

If, with the help of religion, mankind now succeeds in getting international relations under control, I believe that economics and politics will cease to be the absorbing interests of mankind, and that religion will become man's paramount interest again, as in the past.

Dr. Toynbee, internationally famous historian and author of the "Study of History," is the Director of Studies for the Royal Institute of International Affairs and Research Professor in International History at the University of London. He was at the Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey in the spring of 1949. Born in London in 1889, Dr. Toynbee graduated from Balliol College, Oxford, and did war service with the British Foreign office in both world wars.

THE SPIRITUAL IMPLICATION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS COVENANT

by Charles H. Malik

In his *Adventures of Ideas* the late Professor Whitehead teaches that the individual human soul, as a distinct substance with a peculiar origin and an immortal destiny, is a distinctive Platonic-Christian inheritance. He remarks that this doctrine has more moulded the history of the West than any other single doctrine. In his own metaphysical construction Whitehead has no place for this conception of the human soul. Revolting against every notion of substance, he defines the soul as "a personal society of occasions." In this radical subordination of the soul to "experience", to "the universe", to "society", to "the flux", Whitehead typifies his age.

The deepest formulation of the significance of the present international activity in the field of human rights is that it is a faint echo, on the international plane, of a spiritual reaction against the modern dissolution of the human soul. We are trying in effect, knowingly or unknowingly, to go back to the Platonic-Christian tradition which affirms man's original, integral dignity and immortality.

The one great modern phenomenon is the rise of the masses, the destruction of hierarchy, the levelling down of distinction and structure. The term "the masses" is here employed in an ontological sense: it refers to the kind of being and valuation of the masses. This rise is necessarily also a revolt, and as such it was accurately described and predicted by Nietzsche and Dostoyevsky, and in our own days no one has been more sensitive to it than Ortega y Gesset and Heidegger. The phenomenon of "das Man" in Heidegger's "Sein und Zeit" is the most wonderful philosophical description I know of this characterless, dark, distracted, gossipy, irresponsible, self-lost, impersonal, undecisive and unauthentic spirit of the masses. The present issue of human rights may be interpreted as an attempt at restoring the sense of responsible, authentic, personal dignity to the individual human being.

The causes of this rising revolt can be investigated on several different levels. So far as material, economic and social condi-

tions constitute real causation, the masses have rebelled and risen as a result of the industrial revolution. It can be shown that as the masses rose, man, humanity necessarily declined. When you become an atom in a massive ocean of identically like atoms, without structure, without distinction, without ontological differentiation of function, then you lose your sense of essential, inalienable, human individuality. The international work of human rights and fundamental freedoms is a faint effort to recover this lost individuality, to the end that the individual human person should realize his own natural dignity, namely the rights and liberties with which he, as a man, is endowed by nature.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a statement of principle. Even as such it is not perfect. It is not perfect because it is not the creation of a single master mind. If a Plato or a Saint Thomas or a Leibniz were to be assigned the task of elaborating such a document, it would have come out almost a perfect construction, aesthetically, logically and from the point of view of adequacy; but then it would not have the effectiveness and universal appeal that our present Declaration has. The loss in rational perfection is compensated by the gain in universal interest. For it is precisely part of the tender attention to individuality to allow that if a representative should be in a position to claim as his own a comma, or a semi-colon, or a whole text, or a basic idea, the Declaration would mean much more to his country and people. Its perfectionist critics care more for the purity of the idea than for the compulsion of immediate fact.

Already the Declaration, not yet five months old, has had an interesting career. When Vishinsky and Manuilsky on the one hand, and at least three powerful conservative groups in the United States on the other, join in vehemently denouncing this document, I believe it is safe to conclude it must possess peculiar virtues of its own. In important international debates it has been significantly appealed to a score of times.

But the crisis of the Declaration is the projected Covenant. It is there that our professions and the professions of our Governments will be put to the test. Are we prepared to join with others not only in the elaboration of principle but also in the establishment of law? This is the real test of our moral courage and fundamental convictions. The canon of security, which is the North Atlantic treaty, is an external, albeit absolutely necessary, framework; it cries for supplementation by an organon of human

existence drawn from the deepest persuasions of the cumulative, positive Graeco-Roman-Christian, Western tradition. Only then would the Western community feel really secure. For security is not safety from physical attack, but the strength of the spirit knowing and being in the truth, overcoming, at least potentially, every falsehood and every error, and unafraid of, because already triumphant over Satan and death. I believe such positive strength of spirit is the authentic patrimony of the Western world.

It would be tragic if some of those who led at the stage of the Declaration should falter now at the stage of the Covenant. Such faltering need not reflect on them personally; it is rather the moral expression of the stubborn political realities. It signifies that the socio-political situation does not admit of the passage of ideas into law and thence into fact. But this is indeed part of the great crisis. Can Western civilization, which contains at its core, as I believe, the truest reality of human dignity, recover that dignity in fact? Is it so encumbered and overwhelmed by its own accretions and distractions that it simply cannot bind itself by international law to the active realization of a well-articulated, true conception of man? What else is it doing if it is not doing this? To say that separate, silent realization without international codification is sufficient, is to do violence to the rational nature of man: it is already to derogate from his dignity. For if there is truth, we are by nature destined to know it and to articulate it and to share it. And thus either you despair of truth, the deep truth of man, or, if you know it, you must lift it to the lucid form of ideas and share it with others in fact. This means, so far as the problem of man is concerned, a Covenant of Human Rights. In the fact of much hedging and hesitation one is often tempted to think that the truth, which is integrally there, is nevertheless hidden from the view of the Western mind.

Now politics is by nature the sphere of compromise and calculation. A certain degree of untruth and impurity and insincerity must needs cling to the politician. He must carry it as a chastening cross. It will be understood and forgiven only in confession. Thus the full affirmation of man in his truth cannot come in the political sphere. The crisis of human rights consists therefore precisely in the fact that politics is meddling in a field that belongs more properly to the moral and prophetic consciousness. Politics should follow: it should not lead. When, contrary to nature, it is leading in these fundamental matters, then there is something the matter with the Church. For I do

not believe the Church, which has the full deposit of truth, is leading enough in this field. There is certainly preoccupation with trivial problems when the greatest problem of the age, namely whether man can still remain man, with his freedom and laughter and joy and reason and love, is not sufficiently faced by the only agency that can really face and solve it. Politics does not really care; but if the care of God is not itself made potently manifest, then man, and therewith the politician himself, is completely lost.

Either there is a common morality about man which can be codified and not only respected but also actually observed under a rule of law, or we are on the verge of chaos. The proposed Covenant is a symptom of the decay, not a cure. What can arrest and reverse the process of decay is certainly not international machinery, but the spirit of God once again mightily breaking forth through the hearts of men. As in every crisis throughout the long record of human misery, the Church of Christ is the only real answer.

Let the Church therefore be the Church, one, holy, catholic and Apostolic, and the rights of man will be both proclaimed and realized. I yearn and groan for nothing as I do for the unity of the Body of our Lord. In that holy unity alone is man in all his possibilities completely revealed. What a pale and miserable phantom is all our activity for human rights by comparison with the humanity already achieved for all of us in Jesus Christ! Whatever we do with our human covenants, surely He is able to keep His Covenant with us.

Dr. Charles H. Malik is the minister of the Lebanon government to the United States, Lebanese delegate to the United Nations, and former President of the U.N.'s Economic and Social Council. Born in Bitirram, Lebanon, he received his B.A. degree from the American University in Beirut, and after study in America and at the University of Freiburg in Germany, he received his doctorate in Philosophy from Harvard Univeristy in 1937. He was the Lebanese delegate to the San Francisco Conference (1945) and has been closely associated with the United Nations ever since.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND WORLD ORDER

by Charles W. Ranson

The connection between Christian missions and world order is not obvious in a world of power politics. More than four hundred years ago, the father of power politics said that the unarmed prophet is always sure to be destroyed and that his institutions must always come to naught. There are many of this persuasion today and it is not always easy to prove them wrong. The foreign missionary activity of the Church appears to many—even within the churches—as a Quixotic enterprise of little practical relevance in the great affairs of the world. I believe that view to be mistaken. I should like briefly to offer three reasons why I regard the modern missionary enterprise as of historical significance and a factor of importance in international affairs.

1. *First, it is in itself an international undertaking of considerable magnitude.*

During the last few days I have had in my hands the printer's proof of the first comprehensive statistical survey of world missions which has been made since 1934. I have been surprised to find that there are at the present time approximately 24,500 foreign missionaries of the non-Roman Catholic Churches at work in 98 different countries. Of these, about 7,700 are ordained ministers, 6,800 are laymen and over 10,000 are women. It is a fairly safe assumption that these figures can be matched by at least an equal number of Roman Catholic missionaries.

From the Christian Churches of North America, of Great Britain, and the British Dominions and from the stricken lands of Continental Europe, something like 50,000 men and women have been found, equipped, supported and sent to 98 different lands as ambassadors of good will. This vast, purposeful and unselfish embassy has far-reaching significance in international relations.

The modern missionary movement, like every human enterprise, has made mistakes. Some of its agents have done harm as well as much good. But when you have said the worst that can

be said, the fact remains that here is a vast company of Christian men and women who have gone out into all the earth, not seeking to gain but to give.

It is not an insignificant fact, even in the hard-bitten world of politics, that innumerable people in Asia and Africa have learned that there are those in other lands who care for them enough to give their lives and their substance in a service which seeks no reward. That, however, is only a small part of the story. Their efforts have resulted in a momentous historical development—in the rise of a *world Christian community.*

2. *Christian missions are an important factor in world affairs because they have, under God, resulted in a Christianity which is universal not merely in principle but in fact.*

The missionary enterprise has from the beginning been a dramatic reminder of the fact that the world is *not* Europe and America. Today it offers no less striking evidence that the Church is a universal fact—virtually co-extensive with the inhabited earth. In their contemporary setting, Christian missions do not represent the patronising benevolence of the older Christendom. They are a living partnership between older and younger churches within the One, Holy, Catholic Church. They are a vivid demonstration of the possibility of a fellowship which transcends the powerful ties of race and nationality and cultural heritage. By living its own life in harmony among the nations, this great supra-national fellowship is making an impalpable but potent contribution to the building of world order.

This Commission of the Churches on International Affairs can offer no more convincing evidence of its right to speak in the councils of the nations than the fact that it represents a world-wide Christian fellowship that has proved its cohesion even in the fearful disintegrating tensions of war. Not only are there the imponderable influences resulting from the diffusion of the Church among the nations. There are Christian personalities drawn from all parts of the world who play their part as statesmen in the councils of the nations.

I do not think it is fantastic to suggest that the world-wide Christian fellowship, which is the fruit of Christian missions, has something important, perhaps something decisive, to say to those who seek anxiously for the principles of world community.

If the universal Church is to speak that decisive word, it will do so only by the maintenance of its own distinctive message.

There are, after all, other organizations which preach world brotherhood, indulge in world philanthropy, and seek world unity. There are other bodies which have some of the marks of an international society. There is the United Nations Society and the Rotary International. There is also the *Cominform* for those whose internationalism takes a Marxist shape.

Christian missions have always stood and still stand for the primary duty of the Church to preach the *Christian* Gospel to all men. That brings me to the third and last thing which I wish to say.

3. *The proclamation of the Gospel is in itself the most important contribution which Christian missions make to world order.*

That dogmatic assertion would bear a good deal of elaboration. I will only make one point. Those who listened to or read Mr. Churchill's recent speech in Boston may recall an impressive passage in which he spoke of the flame of Christian ethics as our highest guide in public affairs. Mr. Churchill said that he was speaking alike to those who share the blessings and comforts of revealed religion and those who face the mystery of life alone. It is probable that this statement had a friendly reception from many who profess no Christian allegiance. It is pertinent to ask how long the flame of Christian ethics may be expected to burn if the fires of faith and conviction from which it derives are allowed to go out?

Is not our ethical impotence written with terrible clarity across the history of our time? Can we subdue the demonic passions of men and nations merely by talking about the glories of goodwill and the necessity of brotherhood?

Christian missions are rooted in the conviction that in proclaiming a kingdom which is not of this world the Church is making the most distinctive and decisive contribution which it has to offer to the world.

The real driving force of Christian missions is the impulse to make Jesus Christ known and to win men to His service in the followship of His Church. That was the motive which gave the movement birth. That is the dynamic which sustains it generation after generation and keeps it alive today. If the Church loses this sense of missionary compulsion there is little hope that the flame of Christian ethics will ever guide the

nations. For the world is not likely to become more moral than it has been until it becomes more Christian than it is.

Mr. Ransom is the General Secretary of the International Missionary Council. Born in Ireland, he received his education at Queen's Universiay, Belfast, and Oriel College, Oxford. He served with the Methodist Missionary Society in South India from 1929-1943 when he became Secretary of the National Christian Council of India. During 1946 he was appointed Research Secretary of the International Missionary Council, and in 1948 became its General Secretary.

AN ECUMENICAL APPROACH TO THE SOVIET-WESTERN TENSIONS

by W. A. Visser 't Hooft

The World Council of Churches is an organ of churches in all nations for purely Christian purposes. It is unable and does not desire to express any opinion upon the specific political day-to-day problems which arise in the field of Soviet-Western relationships. Moreover, its membership is so far-flung and so divergent in social and political attitudes that it would surely prove impossible to arrive at common agreement on such immediate problems.

But that does not mean that the problem of Soviet-Western tensions leaves us indifferent, for, as the Amsterdam Assembly has clearly reminded us, the underlying issues in that great struggle are spiritual issues. The great conflict of our time is, in the last analysis, an ideological conflict in which the whole conception of man and of his place in society and the universe is at stake. It is therefore inevitable that an organ of the churches concerns itself with this conflict. That is why the churches have spoken out on these matters at the Amsterdam Assembly. That is why they continue to do so.

Since no fully representative meeting of the Council has been held since Amsterdam, (the next one will be in July, in Chichester, England), I cannot make here an official statement on behalf of the World Council. All I can do is to prolong the lines of the Amsterdam Assembly and to indicate what I believe to be the implications of those discussions for the present situation.

(1) The first concern of the World Council in this area must be that neither the ecumenical movement as a whole nor the churches individually shall identify themselves to such an extent with any social or political ideology that religion becomes exploited for purely secular, political ends.

In the present nervous situation in which propaganda plays such a disproportionate role, this danger is acute in all countries. Attempts are made everywhere to obtain religious sanction for politics, which, even if they represent the best possible solution

under the given circumstances, remain purely political decisions with all the elements of self-seeking and self-assertion which are to be found in such decisions. The churches should in this situation be on their guard against a crusade psychology, and they should warn against all tendencies in East and West to make them the spokesmen for political interests of certain nations, classes or parties. In this connection we can only express regret that there are church leaders in both East and West who forget these elementary distinctions between the role of the Church and the role of the State.

(2) The second concern of the World Council must be to defend the fundamental liberty of the church to exercise its evangelistic and prophetic functions without hindrance.

At the present moment this liberty is endangered in a number of Communist-controlled areas and in some nations in the West. The situation in the Communist-controlled countries is not that the churches are persecuted in the way in which they were persecuted in the early stages of the revolution in Russia. The present policy of the governments concerned is more adequately described as a policy of domestication, that is, of forcing the churches into a position in which they restrict themselves to their worship and preaching and exert no influence on public life except when they are invited by the government to support some aspect of the general party line. It is clear that the churches cannot accept this extremely limited view of religious liberty. They must stand by the strong and clear declarations made at the Amsterdam Assembly that it is not merely the privilege but the duty of the churches to proclaim the Christian faith in relation to all aspects of social and international life.

(3) The third concern of the World Council must be to maintain unity among its member-churches, even though, and precisely when, they arrive at divergent solutions as to their relation to the State and to the social order. One of the most precious things about the Amsterdam Assembly was that it brought together churches on both sides of the "iron curtain" and Christians who differed in their attitudes to the main political and social forces of our time. In the meantime, the churches under pressure have made it very clear that their relationship to the world-wide Christian community gives them very great encouragement in their daily struggle for existence. But the fellowship can only be maintained if there is on both sides sufficient imagination and sufficient patience to understand that

the divergence of situation may have to mean a divergence of attitude. We are not all in the same period of history. What is right in the United States is not necessarily right in Hungary and vice versa. There must, however, be the basic confidence that we are all at one in our convictions about the true mission of the Church to proclaim and exemplify the Lordship of Christ over all men and in all realms of life.

(4) The fourth concern of the World Council must be to make it clear that no political or economic system has given a full or even adequate solution to the problems of freedom and justice, of the individual and his relation to society, and that the churches can therefore not accept the strict alternative between a full-fledged collectivism and an extreme individualism.

It is very clear that the churches must take a stand against a collectivism in which man as man is finally destroyed. But it should be equally clear that the churches must raise critical questions about systems in which the responsibility of man for the welfare of his neighbors finds insufficient expression.

The Third Section at Amsterdam expressed the conviction that the responsibility of Christians is to seek new creative solutions. We cannot take that responsibility too seriously. If the World Council can really become a center for those who seek a better way, it will fulfill a great historic mission.

The expression "the third way" can easily be misunderstood. It can be taken to mean a middle way between two extremes. But that is too static a conception. The third way should not be thought of in terms of space but in terms of time. It is the *new* way, the way of tomorrow. It is the way of those who like "the third race" of primitive Christian times, count with the Creative work of the Creator-God in history. It is the search for the solution of the real problems which lie behind the present deadlock between the eastern and western systems. It is the realistic tackling of the problems of social disintegration and economic disruption, which neither capitalism nor Communism can solve, in a way which is compatible with the dignity of man and with his responsbility to his fellows.

The World Council cannot possibly represent a third *political* force. For it cannot and must not enter into the political arena and it is incompetent in the field of social and economic decisions. But it can do increasingly what it began to do at Amsterdam, namely, indicate a general direction which Christians can and should follow in order to lead the world out of its present impasse.

If it does so, it will often be misunderstood. It will be accused by the left and by the right of half-heartedness and of refusing to choose in a world where only two choices seem to be available. But it will draw to itself that great number of men and women in all churches and nations who look beyond the present situation, who are increasingly troubled about the sterility of the war of the propagandas, and who look to the Church for a word of hope which will transcend the present conflict.

(5) The fifth concern of the World Council must be that the ideological conflict and the resulting power-conflict shall not lead to an armed conflict.

Precisely because the basic conflict is in the ideological and spiritual realm, it cannot be settled by arms. A war would leave the major issue unsettled and might well lead to more nihilistic and anarchic developments than we have to deal with at the present. The only way to overcome totalitarianism is the hard way of replacing the faith in Party and State by the faith in the transcendent God to whom all men and all human institutions are ultimately responsible. This is no plea for pacifism, for armaments have their justification in the *defense* of freedom and law. It is, however, a plea for a deeper understanding of our situation. The basic defense must be the filling of that terrifying moral and spiritual vacuum which exists in the West as in the East, which undermines the democracies and makes totalitarianism almost inevitable. At this point the great challenge is to the churches themselves. Will they wake up, break through their isolation from the real life of the world and once more give shape to the life of men, of society and of the world?

Dr. Willem A. Visser 't Hooft is the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches. He has held the post since the Council was provisonally established in 1938. Born in Haarlem, the Netherlands, in 1900, Dr. Visser 't Hooft prepared for his ministry in the Dutch Reformed Church at the University of Leyden, and wrote his doctor's dissertation on "The Background of the Social Gospel in America," after visiting the USA in 1923 and 1924. Prior to becoming General Secretary of the World Council, he was General Secretary of the World Student Christian Federation. Widely known as a theologian, Dr. Visser 't Hooft is the author of many books, the latest of which is "The Kingship of Christ" (1948).

THE CHURCHES AND THE UNITED NATIONS*

by John Foster Dulles

The Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, representing the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council takes a special interest in the United Nations. We believe in the United Nations as a means to justice and peace; we know that we can help the United Nations to achieve those goals and we intend to give that help.

1. We can help to reduce the divisive effect of extreme nationalism. The World Council of Churches itself represents a uniting of churches of forty-four lands, and of one hundred and fifty-five denominations and of many different races and cultures, both of the West and East, while the International Missionary Council embraces fifty-two National Organizations, Conferences and Committees in sixty-eight countries and territories. We have found that there are moral and spiritual impulses that are unifying and that overcome differences which usually divide men into hostile camps. The churches can, and will, strengthen such unifying forces and seek to impart them to the United Nations.

2. We can help to create the world-wide moral sensitiveness that enables the United Nations to be effective. The United Nations has no armies to enforce its will. It depends, for results, on a public opinion that pays attention to its debates and comes to a verdict of "right" or "wrong"; and that verdict must be sufficiently audible so that the Member governments will heed it. The churches can promote that result by promoting a world-wide sense of right and wrong, and an alertness to apply intelligent moral judgments to the conduct of nations as exposed in the debates and proceedings of the United Nations.

3. We can help to lay the foundation needed to enable the United Nations to grow into a world government. Such growth cannot be achieved merely by amending the present Charter or adopting a new one. Law and order depend on laws being mostly self-enforcing because they reflect what most of the community thinks is right, or at least acceptable. Today the

**An Abstract of Mr. Dulles' Address.*

world community is sharply divided as to what is right and what is wrong national conduct and what are human rights that ought to be respected. The division is so sharp that the United Nations does not dare to use even the modest enforcement power it actually possesses, lest it precipitate a war through trying to impose the will of a scant majority upon a determined, convinced and powerful minority. The churches can do the pioneer work of creating more unified moral judgments and thereby they can help to build the foundation for a more adequate international organization.

4. We can help create agreement as to what are human rights and fundamental freedoms, and create the will to respect and observe them, as called for by the U.N. Charter. There are, indeed, no such rights and freedoms except as men take a spiritual view of the nature of man. Thus, Soviet Communists, who reject that spiritual view, claim that men have only such privileges and licenses as the State chooses to allow them from time to time. A religious view of the nature of man is the only view that can produce the sense of human dignity, the tolerance, the living together in peace as good neighbors, which the United Nations seeks. So, in this area also, the churches are indispensable adjuncts of the United Nations.

In all these matters, the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council, working through the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, will not attempt to make authoritative detailed pronouncements with respect to controversial political matters. We shall not seek to become a political pressure group to get particular results. The churches, as such, have no distinctive competence in political matters and we have no desire to intermingle Church and State. The churches' procedure will be to seek to bring to individual Christians a greater awareness of the moral principles that are relevant to their life as citizens. In that way, the churches will help to create the world-wide moral environment needed to enable political institutions to grow in vigor and to bear the desired fruit—justice, liberty and peace.

Mr. John Foster Dulles is an Elder of the Presbyterian Church USA, chairman of the Committee on Policy of the Department of International Justice and Goodwill of the Federal Council of Churches, chairman of the Carnegie Endowment for Inter-

national Peace, and a member of the American delegation to the United Nations General Assembly. Born in Washington, D.C., in 1888, Mr. Dulles was graduated from Princeton University in 1908. He served as a major in the U. S. Army during the First World War and as a legal adviser on war debt negotiations during the 1920's. He was a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco in 1945, and the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers in 1947. He is the author of many books and articles on international subjects.

THE COMMISSION OF THE CHURCHES ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

20 Balcombe Street, London 297 Fourth Avenue, New York

OFFICERS

President.....Baron F. M. van Asbeck *(The Netherlands)*

Chairman.....Mr. Kenneth G. Grubb, C.M.G. *(London)*

Director.....Dr. O. Frederick Nolde *(New York)*

Treasurer.....Mr. W. Rodman Parvin *(New York)*